Hal Verb
P.O. Box 421815
S.F., Ca. 94142-1815

1-16-96

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD. 21702

Dear Hal=

I'm sorry I couldn't write you sooner than this but as you are no doubt aware I am pursuing my interest in getting a book done and just gathering the material together is getting to be a chore. What I want to do is get all the sources I can together and then go over each one & catalogue what I can to zero in on my proposed theme which is that the assassination of JFK occurred in one way and only one way and that all the so-called investigations failed to present a truthful account. The departure point, of course, is when and where did the first shot occur. I will, of course, be citing your original work on this and I'll be expanding it to include proof in the form of film (both movie and still); eye-witness and ear-witness accounts; acoustics evidence; the "jiggle" (or wiggle) analysis of the Z-film; blood splatter analysis and other evidence in support of my basic theme. I hope to have chapters on subjects as=(a) The first shot — when & where; (b) The missing shot; (c) The shot (or shots) striking Connally — when & where (d) The shot (or shots) to JFK's head.

On (d), I will build as best I can a case for

evidence for a double-head shot, as I don't think there was only a single shot to JFK's head.

This will be my basic approach and as I get into this whole affair I believe I can make a case totally convincing for both the layman and the scientific-in-mind.

I've not mentioned that I'm working on a book to too many except for a few friends. I did mention that I was working on a book to Dr. Weckt and he sent me a nice reply (I had sent him two articles on an alleged "alien autopsy" since he was quoted either in the press or on TV that his opinion was solicited. The two articles strongly suggested that the whole alien bit was a hoax which is what I believe). The only "alien beings" I "see" are those on television and you'd be surprised how many believe everything they see. Two programs that unfortunately promote these bizarre ideas are "Unsolved Mysteries" and "Hard Copy." With the recent popularity of the TV show, "The X-Files" little hope exists for really rational and scientific explanations. Of course our daily press is no better.

As you know I usually do send you some Xeroxed item but I wanted to rush this letter off to you and not hold it up until I can get to a Xerox machine. I would hope to do this within a week & then I'll send you what I have.

I know you're going through a terrible winter and have seen on TV what conditions are but I do hope that by the time you receive this letter things will be better for both you and your wife.

Now, to answer some of the points or questions you raised in your previous letters:

(1) On Walt Brown's book: I agree with you that he's off on the wrong track zeroing in on the Dallas police as conspirators. I don't buy it at all & why Walt (whom I thought up until now was a cautious observer) does this is beyond me. Maybe he thought it would be an antidote to Livingstone's latest. But one doesn't need to answer one atrocity with another. I'm puzzled, too.

It could be despite the fact that Walt (it is claimed) has read the Warren Commission's Volumes at least six times may be his undoing. Not seeing the forest for the trees?

I must tell you something about Walt and his book, "Reference Index Guide to the Warren Commission". I've been using this book as part of my work for my own book. Since it (this book) is a guide it should be fairly definitive. But it isn't !! As an example when I was re-examining everything Seth Kantor had said about what occurred on Nov. 22nd Walt left out an entry of 24 pages devoted to a transcript Kantor prepared on what he did and saw for that entire 3 day period (Nov-22 to Nov-24). Had I not known of this entry some other researcher would've avoided it and Kantor was a keen observer on many things. And as the Secret Service men in the Motorcade there are lapses in Brown's book where volume references are not included. I had to pencil in my own references which he failed to include. There are also page citations errors (which I also penciled in to correct his).

Sure it's a guide but it is not ~~definitive~~ definitive which is what is needed. He just missed the boat.

(2) On your point on why Brown cites your name only to others I think this is due to Brown's coming in late on the scene of researches. I don't believe it is a personal thing on his part when he does this to you. It is just sheer inexperience being "around the subject matter".

(3) I recall a writer on Marxist themes (C. L. James) who once wrote, "They write so well because they know so little". James is largely ignored in today's academic world and with thoughts like these it is no wonder!

(4) You mentioned that what was cut from your "Case Open" could be used for my book on the timing of the shots. Yes, I am interested. How can I obtain this? You had mentioned in your letter that a Bill Mills of Hughson, Ca. would send me a copy. I don't know of him & I never did receive anything from him.

(5) After writing my eleven page letter to the ARRB "investigator" on photo evidence I've heard nothing from them. I listed some 60 or so names in the letter & at least I'd expect a one-paragraph short note saying "Thank You" but not even that has come my way. Now that I think of it my article to the Bay Guardian on the performance of the ARRB to date was too soft on them. I should've been harder on them. But the Bay Guardian never printed either my article or Gary's (which was essentially Gary's views on how the ARRB grew out of the public reaction to Stone's "JFK" movie).

(6) Final note - Gary has finally moved. I've not been in touch with him since the last two months.

Well, I better close now & get this mailed out!

Best,
Hal Verb